

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 29, 2007.

Claim 1 is amended, claim 2 is canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17 and 18 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objection

Claim 1 was objected to for claim terminology. The claim has been amended to address the objection raised in the Office Action.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking adequate description or enablement.

With respect to the average thickness of the dielectric material, applicant respectfully points out that such limitation need not be identical in meaning to the claims as originally filed if it is otherwise supported by the original filing. While the limitation may not be identical in meaning to the “average thickness” limitation that applicant originally filed, it is nevertheless supported by the specification and the drawings, and should therefore be permissible under §112. Note specifically that the example presented in Figure 6 shows a coating 605 that is thicker over the microstrip lines 603 and 604 than it is over other areas of the substrate 601, such as the portions of the substrate adjacent to the strip line. More specifically, the example illustrated in Figure 6 shows what is described in the claim limitation in question, as the thickness of the coating material in an area adjacent to the striplines 603 and 604 tapers down to no coating on the substrate on either side of the striplines as illustrated in Figure 6, which clearly illustrates the claim limitation of a coating thickness that is greater over the microstrip lines than over at least one other area of the substrate (e.g. the area around the striplines in Fig. 6).

Because this amendment and response fixes all other objections or rejections to the pending claims, applicant is willing to amend the independent claims (such as by agreeing to an Examiner’s Amendment over telephone) to reflect that “the coating material is applied over the at least one microstrip line in a thickness greater than an average thickness of the coating

material over the substrate”, should this use of the original claim language be deemed preferable to overcome any remaining concerns. The Examiner is invited to telephone applicant at (612) 349-9581 to expedite resolution of any such remaining concerns.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

In light of the Examiner’s comments regarding 1.0 being the lowest dielectric constant reasonably possible, this claim has been cancelled rather than amended.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 349-9581 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ROY E. GREEFF

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 349-9581

Date

July 30 07

By

John M. Dahl

John M. Dahl

Reg. No. 44,639

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 30 day of July 2007.

Lisa Pareske

Name

Lisa Pareske

Signature